Source Selection Statement for the Computational and Information Sciences and Technology Office – Scientific Computing and Technical Services (CISTO-SCTS) Solicitation Number NNG12411365R

On December 11, 2012, I, along with senior officials from the Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC), met with the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals in connection with the Computational and Information Sciences and Technology Office – Scientific Computing and Technical Services (CISTO-SCTS) acquisition.

Procurement Description

The purpose of the CISTO-SCTS contract is to provide high end computing and data support, as well as general support services to the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC) Computational and Information Science and Technology Office (CISTO). The CISTO-SCTS contract will provide Information Technology (IT) and computational services to support the GSFC Sciences and Exploration Directorate (SED). This support includes access to high-performance computing, networking, mass storage, information systems technologies, computational science expertise, real time transmission of satellite data, and support for the NASA High End Computing (HEC) Program.

The CISTO-SCTS Request for Proposal (RFP) was released on April 20, 2012 and 3 subsequent amendments were issued.

The contract is a Cost Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF) Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract with an effective ordering period of 5 years from the date of award which includes a 30 day phase-in period.

This procurement was conducted as a full and open competition under NAICS code 541513 Computer Facilities Management Services with a small business size standard of $25M.

Proposals Submitted

On May 30, 2012 NASA received timely proposals from the following four companies:

Computer Sciences Corporation (CSC)
Lockheed Martin
Raytheon
Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC)

Evaluation Procedures

The SEB evaluated proposals in accordance with the source selection procedures identified in Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) part 15.3 "Source Selections", and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.3, same subject. The Source Evaluation Board procedures at NFS 1815.370, "NASA Source Evaluation Boards" were applied.

The RFP listed three evaluation factors, Mission Suitability, Cost, and Past Performance. The RFP specified the relative order of importance of these factors as follows:

> The Cost Factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability Factor and the Past Performance Factor. As individual factors, the Cost Factor is less important than the Mission Suitability Factor but more important than the Past Performance Factor.

Within Mission Suitability, three Subfactors were evaluated: A. Understanding the Technical Approach, Scenarios, and Representative Task Orders; B. Management Plan; and C. Small Business Utilization. The three Subfactors were point scored using an allocation of 1,000 available points, suballocated as follows:

Subfactor A	Understanding the Technical Approach, Scenarios, and Representative Task Orders	500
Subfactor B	Management Plan	400
Subfactor C	Small Business Utilization	100

The Mission Suitability Subfactors were evaluated using the adjectival rating, definitions, and percentile ranges at NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(a). The Mission Suitability factor was weighted and scored on a 1000-point scale. After weighting the findings for the individual subfactors according to the RFP, the SEB assigned individual adjectival ratings to each subfactor under the Mission Suitability Factor. The applicable adjectival ratings were "Excellent," "Very Good," "Good," "Fair," and "Poor," as described in Section M of the RFP. The maximum points available for each subfactor were multiplied by the assessed percent for each subfactor to derive the score for the particular subfactor.

The proposed costs of the Representative Task Orders (RTOs) and the rates proposed in the Attachment B, Direct Labor Rates, Indirect Rates, and Fixed Fee Matrices, were assessed to determine reasonableness and cost realism. The evaluation was conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(1) and NFS 1815.305(a)(1)(B).

Past Performance evaluations were based on FAR Part 15 and were conducted in accordance with provision M.5 of the solicitation. As stated in provision L.18, an Offeror's past performance record indicates the relevant quantitative and qualitative aspects of performing services or delivering products similar in size and content to the requirements of this acquisition.

An Offeror's Past Performance was assigned an overall confidence rating that reflects a subjective evaluation of the information contained in the written narrative, past performance

evaluation input provided through customer questionnaires, and other references. The applicable level of confidence ratings were: Very High, High, Moderate, Low, Very Low, and Neutral, as set forth and described in Section M.5 of the RFP.

For purposes of past performance, the term "Offeror" refers to a prime contractor and its significant subcontractors. Accordingly, the past performance of significant subcontractors was also evaluated and attributed to the Offeror. The past performance of a significant subcontractor was compared to the work proposed to be performed by that subcontractor, and weighted accordingly in assigning the overall past performance adjectival rating to the Offeror. The past performance of the prime contractor was weighted more heavily than any significant subcontractor or combination of significant subcontractors in the overall past performance evaluation.

Detailed Results of the Evaluation

Mission Suitability Factor

The table below provides the adjectival ratings assigned in each mission suitability factor for the four CISTO-SCTS proposals:

Offeror	Subfactor A	Subfactor B	Subfactor C
CSC	Very Good	Very Good	Excellent
Lockheed Martin	Fair	Good	Good
Raytheon	Fair	Very Good	Very Good
SAIC	Good	Good	Very Good

Subfactor A: Understanding the Technical Approach, Scenarios, and Representative Task Orders

Computer Sciences Corporation (CSC)

Computer Sciences Corporation received 3 significant strengths, 1 strength, 3 weaknesses, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 deficiencies, resulting in an adjectival rating of Very Good for this subfactor.

Significant Strength #1

CSC's response demonstrates an excellent understanding of current technologies and proposes approaches about how to use those technologies in ways that can greatly enhance CISTO's operations and procurement processes. Among other things, CSC proposed proactive archive

policies, novel methodologies to reduce purchasing time, and the use of software to ensure system performance is maintained. These responses provide the Government with confidence that CSC is capable of designing technical solutions that are effective, efficient, and advance the state-of-the-art in high-end computing and data services, which greatly enhance the potential for successful performance and contributes significantly toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the government.

Significant Strength #2

Scenario 1 (Evaluation of Advanced Technology) of the RFP allows the Offeror to demonstrate the depth of their understanding about future technology trends of particular importance to the development of CISTO's high-performance computing capabilities. CSC's overall approach to evaluating and integrating advanced technology revealed a deep understanding and strong capacity for innovation that would help CISTO advance the state-of-the-art in high-performance computing, thereby greatly enhancing the potential for successful performance and contributing significantly toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the government.

Significant Strength #3

Scenario 5 (Data Management) of the RFP presents challenges that allow the Offeror to demonstrate the depth of their understanding about technologies and approaches of particular importance to the development of CISTO's applied R&D activities and climate data services. In their response to this Scenario, CSC demonstrated that they are proactive in their adoption and extension of CISTO's cloud-based Virtual Climate Data Server technology. This provides the Government with confidence that CSC can help CISTO advance the state of the art in climate data services, which greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance and contributes significantly toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the Government.

Strength #1

CSC demonstrates a willingness to engage stakeholders in the development of technical solutions. They also propose cost sharing strategies with CISTO stakeholders that could potentially supplement funding. This is valuable because these approaches build shared commitment to success, enhance the potential for successful performance, and contribute toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the Government.

Weakness #1

In its response to Scenario 1 (Evaluation of Advanced Technology), CSC did not adequately address how the evaluation process required in Scenario 1 will be managed. This shortcoming reduces the Government's confidence in CSC's proposal and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #2

In its response to RTO2, CSC did not provide adequate justification in support of the skill levels proposed for the file system and system administrator positions. This shortcoming reduces the Government's confidence in CSC's proposal and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #3

In its response to RTO3, CSC did not adequately respond to requirement #3 that directed the Offeror to describe their approach to generating climatology data sets in support of the direct readout Visible Infrared Imaging Radiometer Suite Environmental Data Records. This shortcoming reduces the Government's confidence in CSC's proposal and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor A: Understanding the Technical Approach, Scenarios, and Representative Task Orders

Lockheed Martin

Lockheed Martin received 1 significant strength, 2 strengths, 2 weaknesses, 2 significant weaknesses, and 0 deficiencies, resulting in an adjectival rating of Fair for this subfactor.

Significant Strength #1

Lockheed Martin proposes innovations that would significantly enhance the way CISTO engages current and future customers in its policy development and product delivery. Lockheed Martin proposes alternatives for archive policies that will be beneficial to the Government, including an effective communication plan, as well as the use of applications for data service products. The Lockheed Martin response in these areas demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of end user requirements and a willingness to engage stakeholders in the development of technical solutions. This is valuable because such an approach builds a shared commitment to success, greatly enhances the potential for successful performance, and contributes significantly toward

exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the Government.

Strength #1

Lockheed Martin proposes an approach that would enhance the day-to-day management of computer services and deepen the engagement of the user community with the National Center for Climate Simulation (NCCS). Lockheed Martin proposes an approach which ensures system functionality and performance, and fosters the development of a knowledge base to share information between CISTO and its user community. Taken together, these enhancements would improve the effectiveness and efficiency of NCCS operations. Lockheed Martin's response provides the Government with confidence that the Offeror is capable of designing technical solutions that enhance the potential for successful performance and contribute toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the Government.

Strength #2

Lockheed Martin has proposed the sharing of technology roadmaps that it prepares for other customers. This increases the Government's confidence that the Offeror would be able to develop effective technical solutions, which enhances the potential for successful performance, and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the Government.

Weakness #1

In RTO 1 (Major Procurement and Integration), Lockheed Martin did not provide an adequate explanation to support its proposed timeframe for installation and integration activities. Consequently, the Government was unable to assess potential impacts to customer service, control the risk of service interruptions, or estimate resource requirements and cost of the work, which increase the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #2

In Scenario 1 (Evaluation of Advanced Technology), Lockheed Martin failed to adequately address how the evaluation process required in Scenario 1 will be managed. This shortcoming reduces the Government's confidence in Lockheed Martin's proposal and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Significant Weakness #1

Lockheed Martin failed to provide an adequate explanation for how the work in Scenario 2 (Major Discover Software Upgrade) would be performed. Among other things, Lockheed Martin did not provide an adequate explanation of its proposed timeframe for accomplishing the work. The proposed duration for accomplishing the work poses serious risks to Discover Cluster operations. Without an adequate explanation for how this work would be performed or risks would be managed, the Government is unable to assess potential impacts to customer service, control the risk of service interruptions, or estimate resource requirements and cost of the work, which appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Significant Weakness #2

In RTO 2 (Operations Support), Lockheed Martin did not provide an adequate explanation for how the work required in RTO 2 will be performed and did not provide an adequate explanation to assess staffing realism. In addition, Lockheed Martin did not provide an adequate explanation of recurring activities expected in an operational environment. Without these explanations, the Government is unable to assess potential impacts to customer service, control the risk of service interruptions, or estimate resource requirements and cost of the work, which appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor A: Understanding the Technical Approach, Scenarios, and Representative Task

Raytheon

Raytheon received 0 significant strengths, 2 strengths, 5 weaknesses, and 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 deficiencies, resulting in an adjectival rating of Fair for this subfactor.

Strength #1

Raytheon proposes an approach that would enhance the day-to-day management of CISTO's high-end computing systems. The proposed technical solutions enhance the potential for successful performance and contribute toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the government.

Strength #2

As CISTO has made a significant investment in the use of E-iRODS in its growing data services mission, Raytheon's commitment to the continued evolution of this technology enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the Government.

Weakness #1

In Scenario 1 (Evaluation of Advance Technology), Raytheon's proposed technology roadmap is narrow and did not adequately address key technologies outside of hardware that could potentially impact the future of the NCCS as required in the RFP. The Offeror's lack of detail in the proposed roadmap raises a concern about the depth of their understanding of key technologies, which increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #2

In Scenario 2 (Major Discover Software Upgrade), Raytheon describes how the user community is informed of software upgrades, but there is no process or method to allow users to test their codes as part of the upgrade process, as required in the RFP. The lack of process for coordinating upgrades and testing with users raises the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #3

In RTO 2 (Operations Support), the Offeror did not provide sufficient detail to justify their proposed staffing. Raytheon's inadequate justification for their proposed staffing demonstrates a lack of resource realism that could reduce the effectiveness and efficiency of NCCS operations, resulting in an increased risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #4

In RTO 3 (Direct Readout Laboratory), Raytheon's proposal did not adequately describe the process for modifying climatology data sets (requirement #3), nor did it adequately describe direct readout development support, including a development approach, implementation plan, schedule, and model for maintenance and sustainment, for the Visible Infrared Imaging Radiometer Suite Environmental Data Records (requirement #4). These shortcomings suggest that the Offeror does not fully understand the requirements and may not be able to perform the necessary work, reducing the Government's confidence in Raytheon's proposal and increasing the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #5

In RTO 3 (Direct Readout Laboratory), Raytheon proposes an inadequate level of staffing to support requirement #4. Raytheon's proposal of inadequate staffing demonstrates a lack of

resource realism that would reduce the effectiveness and efficiency of the Direct Readout Laboratory, thereby increasing the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor A: Understanding the Technical Approach, Scenarios, and Representative Task Orders

Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC)

Science Applications International Corporation received 1 significant strength, 1 strength, 1 weakness, 2 significant weaknesses, and 0 deficiencies, resulting in an adjectival rating of Good for this subfactor.

Significant Strength #1

SAIC proposes several innovations that will enhance the way CISTO's high-end computing and storage systems are managed and procured. SAIC's response demonstrates a strong understanding of emerging technologies and how to use those technologies in ways that can improve CISTO's operations. This greatly enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes significantly toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the Government.

Strength #1

SAIC is proactive in facilitating stakeholder engagement. SAIC's approach to customer engagement during major software upgrades, development of archive data policies, and user application support enhance the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the Government.

Weakness #1

SAIC's proposal did not provide adequate staffing to interface with the NASA Facilities Engineers in support of RTO1 – Major Procurement and Integration. SAIC's staffing plan would lead to inefficiencies that would require additional work on the part of the Government to coordinate and repair, resulting in an increased risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Significant Weakness #1

In its response to Scenario 2 (Major Discover Software Upgrade), SAIC's proposal failed to adequately describe the work required to create the software stack for the upgrade, did not allow for sufficient time to test the resulting software stack, and did not allow for sufficient time for

user testing. Taken together, these shortcomings raise concern about the depth of the SAIC's understanding of the requirements and their ability to successfully perform the work. Failure to provide an adequate technical approach to meeting the requirements in Scenario 2 appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Significant Weakness #2

In its response to RTO3 (Direct Readout Laboratory), SAIC's proposal did not adequately address specific requirements and deliverables requested in the RFP. Climatology datasets necessary for requirement #3 are not generated, requirement #8 is not fully addressed, and the approach to provide Deliverable #5 is inadequately described. Failure to provide an adequate technical approach to meeting the requirements for RTO3 appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor B: Management Plan

Computer Sciences Corporation

Computer Sciences Corporation received 1 significant strength, 3 strengths, 1 weakness, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 deficiencies, resulting in an adjectival rating of Very Good for this subfactor.

Significant Strength #1

CSC has assembled an extended network of technology experts that can support a broad array of contract activities. In addition, CSC proposes extended expertise, reach back capabilities and teaming arrangements which interface with the E-iRods development team. These approaches increase the Government's confidence that CSC would be able to develop innovative, effective, and state-of-the-art technical solutions, which greatly enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes significantly toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the government.

Strength #1

CSC proposes the use of a suite of technical management applications that will enhance their ability to deliver quality service to the Government. Providing an integrated suite of management capabilities will enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the NCCS operations, thereby contributing toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the Government.

Strength #2

CSC has proposed a comprehensive and detailed management plan that brings efficiencies to the CISTO-SCTS organization. CSC's approach builds a foundation to effectively deliver quality services, operate those services at a high level, and tracks how well those services are being delivered. The proposed management plan gives a high level of confidence that CSC can manage the work in an efficient and effective manner, which contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the Government.

Strength #3

CSC proposes a comprehensive, well structured, and effective phase-in plan that would provide an orderly transition of management and personnel. CSC's phase-in would ensure the continuity of ongoing CISTO and NCCS operations. CSC's phase-in plan for staffing and maintaining a qualified workforce increases the potential for successful contract performance.

Weakness #1

CSC has proposed a staffing plan that relies heavily on the Service Delivery Functional Lead. This shortcoming in CSC's staffing plan could reduce overall effectiveness of the contractor team, resulting in an increased risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor B: Management Plan

Lockheed Martin

Lockheed Martin received 0 significant strengths, 1 strength, 2 weaknesses, 0 significant strengths, and 0 deficiencies, resulting in an adjectival rating of Good for this subfactor.

Strength #1

Lockheed Martin has assembled an extended network of technology experts that can support a broad array of contract activities. This increases the Government's confidence that the Offeror would be able to provide reach back into a pool of domain specific resources, which enhances the potential for successful performance, and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the Government.

Weakness #1

Lockheed Martin does not adequately account for communications between major components of the CISTO organization, particularly the emerging data services and research and development activities. Ineffective interfaces with the Government can lead to poor

communications, inefficiencies, and ineffective task execution, which increase the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #2

Lockheed Martin's position qualifications for several labor categories lack the range of skills and expertise needed to meet the requirements of high-end computing systems and facilities as described in the SOW. Lockheed Martin's proposed position qualifications raises a concern about their level of understanding of the requirements and their ability to provide adequate staffing support, which increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor B: Management Plan

Raytheon

Raytheon received 1 significant strength, 1 strength, 0 weaknesses, and 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 deficiencies, resulting in an adjectival rating of Very Good for this subfactor.

Significant Strength #1

Raytheon has proposed a strong collection of partnerships and corporate resources in support of CISTO. Raytheon's plan to regularly convene meetings of experts and their proposed interface with the E-iRODS development group brings a significant value to the Government, reduces risk, and contributes significantly toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the Government.

Strength #1

Raytheon proposes a comprehensive, well-structured, and effective phase-in plan that would provide an orderly transition of management and personnel, would minimize the impact of a change in prime contractor, and would ensure the continuity of ongoing CISTO and NCCS operations. Raytheon's strong phase-in plan therefore enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Subfactor B: Management Plan

Science Applications International Corporation

Science Applications International Corporation received 0 significant strengths, 2 strengths, 0 weaknesses, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 deficiencies, resulting in an adjectival rating of Good for this subfactor.

Strength #1

SAIC proposed regular meetings and electronic communications with the SAIC High Performance Computing Community of Practice. SAIC's access to a wide range of technical experts increases the potential for successful contract performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the Government.

Strength #2

SAIC has proposed a comprehensive and detailed management plan that brings efficiencies to the CISTO-SCTS organization. SAIC's detailed management plan enhances the potential for successful contract performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the Government.

Subfactor C: Small Business Utilization

Computer Sciences Corporation

Computer Sciences Corporation received 1 significant strength, 0 strengths, 0 weaknesses, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 deficiencies, resulting in an adjectival rating of Excellent for this subfactor.

Significant Strength #1

CSC's proposal offered a high level of commitment to the improvement of small businesses through its proposed use of mentor protégé agreements and use of executed teaming agreements. In addition, CSC's approach exceeds the small business subcontracting goal and the government's subcontracting goal for women-owned small business. The proposed use of small businesses and improvement of small business greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance and contributes significantly toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the Government.

Subfactor C: Small Business Utilization

Lockheed Martin

Lockheed Martin received 0 significant strengths, 1 strength, 0 weaknesses, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 deficiencies, resulting in an adjectival rating of Good for this subfactor.

Strength #1

Lockheed Martin's proposal offered a high level of commitment to the improvement of small businesses through its proposed use of mentor protégé agreements and use of executed teaming agreements. The proposed use of small businesses and improvement of small business enhances the potential for successful contract performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the Government.

Subfactor C: Small Business Utilization

Raytheon

Raytheon received 1 significant strength, 0 strengths, 1 weakness, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 deficiencies, resulting in an adjectival rating of Very Good for this subfactor.

Significant Strength #1

Raytheon's proposal offered a high level of commitment to the improvement of small businesses through its proposed use of mentor protégé agreements and use of executed teaming agreements. In addition, Raytheon's approach exceeds the small business subcontracting goal. The proposed use of small businesses and improvement of small business greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance and contributes toward significantly exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the Government.

Weakness #1

In the proposed small business goals, Raytheon fails to meet the NASA goals for subcontracting to Women Owned Small Business. The failure to meet this goal increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Science Applications International Corporation

Science Applications International Corporation received 1 significant strength, 0 strengths, 0 weaknesses, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 deficiencies, resulting in an adjectival rating of Very Good for this subfactor.

Significant Strength #1

SAIC's proposal offered a high level of commitment to the improvement of small businesses through its proposed use of mentor protégé agreements and use of executed teaming agreements. In addition, SAIC's approach exceeds the Veteran-Owned Small Business goals. The proposed use of small businesses and improvement of small business greatly enhances the potential for

successful contract performance and contributes significantly toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the Government.

Cost Factor

The offerors proposed and probable cost, from lowest cost to highest, is as follows: Raytheon, SAIC, CSC, Lockheed Martin. The lowest three offerors had proposed and probable costs that were very close to each other, within 3% in total probable and within 8% in total proposed. Lockheed Martin's proposed and probable cost was significantly higher than all other offerors.

Past Performance Factor

As a result of the evaluation process, the final CISTO-SCTS Source Evaluation Board ratings are summarized below:

Offeror	Overall Confidence Rating
CSC	Very High
Lockheed Martin	Very High
Raytheon	High
SAIC	Very High

CSC

CSC and its team received all very high overall performance ratings across multiple very highly relevant contracts. Accordingly, CSC was assigned an overall confidence level rating of Very High by the SEB. This level of confidence rating is reflective of the CISTO-SCTS SEB's subjective evaluation of the information contained in the written narrative, past performance evaluation input provided through customer questionnaires, and other references.

Lockheed Martin

Lockheed Martin and its team received very high overall performance ratings across multiple very highly and moderately relevant contracts. In addition, Lockheed Martin's team received a high overall performance rating on a highly relevant contract reference. The SEB assigned an overall confidence level rating of Very High to Lockheed Martin's proposal as a result of its mostly very high overall performance ratings across multiple contracts. This level of confidence rating is reflective of the CISTO-SCTS SEB's subjective evaluation of the information contained

in the written narrative, past performance evaluation input provided through customer questionnaires, and other references.

Raytheon

Raytheon demonstrated moderate, high and very high overall performance ratings across multiple very highly relevant contracts. The SEB assigned an overall confidence level rating of High to Raytheon's proposal as a result of the balance between Very High, High and moderate overall performance ratings assigned across multiple very highly relevant contract references. This level of confidence rating is reflective of the CISTO-SCTS SEB's subjective evaluation of the information contained in the written narrative, past performance evaluation input provided through customer questionnaires, and other references.

SAIC

SAIC demonstrated High and Very High overall performance ratings across multiple high and very highly rated relevant contracts. The SEB assigned an overall confidence level of Very High to SAIC's proposal because it received mostly Very High performance ratings across high and very highly relevant contract references. This level of confidence rating is reflective of the CISTO-SCTS SEB's subjective evaluation of the information contained in the written narrative, past performance evaluation input provided through customer questionnaires, and other references.

Source Selection Decision

I have carefully reviewed the SEB's presentation materials and accompanying CISTO-SCTS Cost Evaluation Reports generated for each of the individual offerors. I determined that the findings presented by the SEB, as documented in its presentation and supported by the accompanying Cost Evaluation Reports were detailed, consistent with the evaluation criteria in the CISTO-SCTS RFP, and provided a clear description of the merits of each proposal. At the presentation meeting, I questioned the SEB with regard to its rationale for the findings and the adjectival ratings and scores for the mission suitability subfactors, and also questioned the rationale for the evaluation of cost and past performance. Moreover, I solicited the views of my ex-officio advisors in their areas of expertise. I determined that the findings were reasonable and valid for the purpose of making a selection decision. In determining which proposal offered the best value to NASA, I referred to the relative order of importance of the three evaluation factors as specified in the RFP:

"The Cost Factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability Factor and the Past Performance Factor. As individual Factors, the Cost Factor is less

important than the Mission Suitability Factor but more important than the Past Performance Factor."

Regarding the Mission Suitability Factor, the most important factor, I noted that the proposal submitted by CSC was technically superior to the proposals submitted by SAIC, Raytheon and Lockheed Martin based on the content of the findings. I also noted that CSC's proposal received the highest individual subfactor adjectival ratings in Subfactors A and C, and it received a Very Good rating for its response to Subfactor B. Finally, I also noted that CSC's proposal received the highest overall total point score, and the highest point score amongst all Offerors in Subfactors A, B and C.

Regarding Subfactor A, the most heavily weighted subfactor, I noted CSC's Very Good rating was higher than SAIC (Good), Lockheed Martin (Fair) and Raytheon (Fair). I was particularly impressed with CSC's proposal response to Subfactor A, which resulted in three Significant Strengths, one Strength and three weaknesses. The three Significant Strengths assigned to CSC's proposal reflect CSC's ability to design technical solutions that will advance state-of-the art high-end computing and data services, foster an environment for innovation that will help CISTO to advance high performance computing, and reflect a proactive approach which adopts cloud-based Virtual Climate Data Server technology. These technical features all demonstrate forward-looking technical solutions that reflect a strong capacity for innovation while maintaining a deep understanding of technologies and approaches required for the CISTO program to succeed. I also noted that CSC did receive three weakness findings in Subfactor A, but I find these to be relatively minor weaknesses that did not significantly detract from their proposal. While SAIC and Lockheed Martin also received individual Significant Strength findings related to innovations in this subfactor, these proposals also received multiple Significant Weakness findings that detracted from their proposed approach to Subfactor A. I considered Raytheon's two strengths and five weaknesses, and did not consider it competitive with CSC's Subfactor A proposal. In summary, CSC's proposal offerors a significant technical advantage in Subfactor A over the other three Offerors.

With respect to Subfactor B (Management Plan), the second most important subfactor, I noted that CSC and Raytheon offered strong proposals and were the only offerors who received Significant Strength findings and were assigned Very Good adjectival ratings. These Significant Strengths were for their proposed use of partnerships and technology experts, as well as for their proposed use of E-iRod development teams. While CSC and Raytheon also both received Strengths for their comprehensive phase-in plans, I noted a discriminator between CSC and Raytheon within Subfactor B for CSC's proposed comprehensive management plan and its proposed use of a suite of technical management applications and tools that will enhance CSC's

ability to deliver quality services. Although CSC received a weakness finding for its proposed use of a Service Delivery Functional Lead in its staffing plan, this finding does not offset the benefits associated with CSC's proposed management plan and technical management applications and tools. Overall, as a result of these two strength findings, I found that CSC's Subfactor B proposal offered a slight advantage over Raytheon's Subfactor B proposal. While Lockheed Martin and SAIC received Good adjectival ratings in this Subfactor, they received no Significant Strengths in this area and therefore I did not find these proposals to be as competitive as those submitted by CSC and Raytheon.

With respect to Subfactor C (Small Business Utilization), the least important subfactor, CSC and SAIC were both assigned Significant Strengths. Raytheon also received a Significant Strength, but was also assigned a weakness for its approach to Subfactor C in the area of Women Owned Small Business subcontracting. Lockheed Martin received an individual Strength finding in this subfactor, resulting in a Good rating. While CSC, SAIC and Raytheon submitted particularly strong proposals in this subfactor, I did not find any meaningful discriminators between them in this subfactor.

Regarding the cost evaluation, Lockheed Martin had a total evaluated probable cost that was significantly higher than those offered by Raytheon, SAIC and CSC. Though Raytheon offered the lowest total evaluated probable cost, CSC's total evaluated probable cost was within 3% of Raytheon's total probable cost. Based on this relatively minimal cost differential, probable cost is not a discriminator, and the technical and managment advantages offered by CSC in its proposal more than offset the minimal cost premium associated with CSC's total evaluated probable cost.

Regarding the past performance evaluation, I noted that SAIC, CSC and Lockheed Martin all had Very High past performance ratings, while Raytheon received a High past performance rating. I reviewed the details and basis for those ratings and the Past Performance Factor was not a discriminator in the selection decision, as SAIC, CSC and Lockheed Martin all received Very High ratings.

In view of the preceding discussion and of the relative importance of the three evaluation factors identified in the RFP, I found that CSC's Mission Suitability proposal offered significant technical advantages over the other three offerors, particularly within Subfactor A and Subfactor B. Given that the Cost Factor is less important than the Mission Suitability factor, the technical and management advantages offered by CSC's proposal more than offset the minimal cost premium associated with CSC's proposal. CSC also received a Very High past performance rating. Therefore, I select CSC for the award of the CISTO-SCTS contract.

Christyl Johnson

Christyl Johnson
Source Selection Authority

1-11-13

Date